

### **REMARKS**

Applicants request reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application in view of the amendments made to the claims. The following remarks state Applicants' bases for making this request and are organized according to the Examiner's Action by paragraph number.

Applicants note and appreciate that Claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and that Claims 2, 3 and 6-8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **ELECTION/RESTRICTION**

1. The Examiner states that Applicants' election without traverse of Claim 1-3 and 6-8 on October 6, 2003 is acknowledged.
2. The Examiner states that Claims 4 and 9-89 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species/group there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicants believe that there are 92 claims as stated on the "Office Action Summary" sheet and requests the Examiner consider the status of Claims 90-92.

### **GENERAL STATUS**

3. The Examiner states that this is a second action on the merits of amendment received October 6, 2003 of application filed June 12, 2001. Claims 1-89 are pending. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are being examined, while Claims 4 and 9-89 are withdrawn from consideration. As noted above in paragraph 2, Claims 1-92 are believed to be pending, and Applicants request the Examiner consider the status of Claims 90-92 in the February 21, 2003 Amendment.

### DRAWINGS

4. The Examiner states that the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “ground conductor” as claimed in Claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Applicants wish to point out that Claim 1 recites “a ground conductor thickness of a coupling portion...”; on page 7, lines 24-25 “ground conductors” are defined as the threaded portion of the plug connector 3, the coupling portion coupling the female thread 13 which is an outer conductor of the jack connector 2, with the housing 1, the shield members 7a and 7b, and the outer conductor 14 of the coaxial cable 8, and the thickness of the ground conductors is in all cases at least 0.1 mm. The above are examples of the ground conductors in the present application as recited in Claim 1. The ground conductor elements are shown in FIG. 1 and described in the application. Applicants believe that the requirements under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) are provided and supported by the Specification, and that the ground conductor feature recited in Claim 1 is shown in FIG. 1. Therefore, no change is required to FIG. 1 for the above objections.

5. The Examiner states that the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(P)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: “8a” and “8b”. Applicant has amended FIG. 1 to replace each of the reference numbers 8a and 8b with 8 and has marked-up these changes in red for approval by the Examiner.

6. The Examiner states that the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: “41”.

Applicant has corrected the Specification on page 13, line 1 by replacing "41" with "41a" which is shown in FIG. 5, FIG. 8 and FIG. 9. Therefore, there is no correction needed to the drawings.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

7,8. The Examiner states that Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner states that regarding Claim 1, Applicants states "...wherein a ground conductor thickness is at least twice the skin depth of what??? Examiner was unsure what the Applicant was referring to. It was understood by the Examiner that Applicant was referring to the skin depth of the coupling portion of the ground conductor. Clarification is required. Furthermore, Applicant states, "...due to a skin effect at a transmission signal frequency." It was unclear as to what transmission signal frequency. Examiner understood that it could be ANY transmission signal frequency.

Applicants wish to point out that the "skin depth" is known in the art as "a depth of current flowing by a skin effect". Moreover, Applicants refer to the skin depth at the lowest frequency in a transmission signal frequency band, since the skin depth becomes the largest when the frequency is lowest. Generally, the largest depth is a standard to calculate a minimum and necessary depth of a ground conductor. One skilled in the art knows that a skin effect occurs when the transmission signal frequency is high such as 10 MHz. When the frequency is low, the skin effect does not occur generally. However, Applicants are amending Claim 1 to make it definite by calling for "A ground conductor thickness of a coupling portion coupling the noise elimination circuit with the coaxial connectors is at least twice a skin depth of current flowing due to a skin effect at a high transmission signal frequency." Therefore, Applicants believe that Claim 1 (as amended) is definite and that Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are now patentable.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

9. The Examiner states that Claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants believe that Claim 1 (as amended) is definite as described in paragraph 8 above, and therefore Claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

10. The Examiner states that Claims 2, 3 and 6-8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have answered the 112 rejection(s) above and Applicants have amended Claim 1 to make it definite. Applicants believe that Claim 1 is allowable and Claims 2, 3, and 6-8, which are dependent on Claim 1 either directly or indirectly, are likewise patentable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that Claims 1-3 and 6-8 as amended are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested. Accordingly, it is requested that Claims 1-3 and 6-8 be allowed and the case be sent to issue.

If there are any questions, we urge the Examiner to call us. Please charge any costs in connection with this document to our Deposit Account No. 16-0875.

Respectfully Submitted,  
PEARSON & PEARSON, LLP

By *Walter F. Dawson*

WALTER F. DAWSON, Attorney,  
Reg. No. 30,046  
10 George Street  
Lowell, Massachusetts 01852  
(978) 452-1971